



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## HICKES'S ADDITIONS TO THE RUNIC POEM.<sup>1</sup>

IN his *Thesaurus* (1705, Vol. I, p. 135) Hickes gives a copy of the Old-English Runic Poem from the manuscript *Cottoniana Otho*, B 10, which was burned in 1731. As the manuscript is gone, we shall always be dependent upon Hickes's printed copy, unless some manuscript closely related to *Cot. Otho* should turn up.

The chief question that presents itself is this: Did Hickes find in *Cot. Otho* all that he gives us in his transcription of the Runic Poem? And if he added to it, where did he get what he added? It is my object in this paper to answer these questions as far as the material at present accessible to me will permit.

Hickes arranged the poem so that the account of each rune begins a new line, and he placed the runes in a column in the left margin, so that each rune stands opposite the line in which it is treated of. Our knowledge of other Old-English manuscripts makes us doubt that this was so in the manuscript of the Runic Poem. The column of runes is preceded by a column of phonological values and is followed by a column of rune-names. In the case of some of the runes, one or more variant forms are given, and at the bottom of the column are added certain runes that are not dealt with in the poem.<sup>2</sup> It is, *a priori*, very unlikely that all this grammatical lore was in the manuscript of the Runic Poem. The way that Hickes writes the names makes it appear that putting them in was an afterthought with him; indeed, I believe I can trace them to their source, but I refrain from saying

<sup>1</sup> This paper is accompanied by two reproductions: (1) Page 10 of *Cottoniana Domit.*, A 9, slightly reduced from a photograph by Dossetter, London, and (2) the left edge of page 135 of the first volume of HICKES's *Thesaurus*, from a photograph by Randall, Ann Arbor. The reader will find it necessary to make constant reference to these reproductions.

<sup>2</sup> The *ea*-rune is the last one that has a verse. In some unaccountable way, WÜLKER (*Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Poesie*, Vol. I, p. 336) gives  $\Psi$  for  $\Upsilon$ , just as he does in the Love Letter, p. 308. He omits some of the variants, totally misrepresents the *p*-rune and the second *h*-rune (*coh*), and, in general, represents the runes with such types as the printer chanced to have in stock, regardless of the forms in the original. I may state here that in this paper I am still using types cut by myself. But I take pleasure in announcing that, through the enlightened generosity of Mr Junius Beal of Ann Arbor, American scholars and American printers will soon have access to types that will enable them to print any ordinary inscription, whether Greek, Latin, or Runic.

Seon. auz. dom. of. p. d. c. e. g. f. u. p. e. n. h. e. d. n. o. u. d. e. c. e. g. e. n. f. i. g. e. l. p. e. e. n. d.

ƿ. n. ƿ. ƿ. h. x. ƿ. n. 4. 1. ƿ. s. e. y.

ƿ. u. ƿ. o. ƿ. c. s. u. u. h. n. 1. s. g. e. o. p. x. ƿ.

em bere. efel. deg. lagu. inc. mium. ƿ. p. ac. ƿ. e. c. ƿ. e. ƿ. e. ƿ. e.

ƿ. ƿ. m. m. ƿ. ƿ. x. m. ƿ. ƿ. f. ƿ. m. ƿ.

ƿ. b. e. m. 1. m. s. d. o. e. d. a. e. y. e. a. p.

orent. cest. sole. z. ec. alle.

10. 9. ƿ. ƿ. 5

\*. ƿ. ƿ. ƿ. ƿ. ƿ. ƿ.

10. ƿ. ƿ. ƿ. ƿ. ƿ. ƿ.

f. ƿ. ƿ. 1. pecunia. R. Rad. 1. ƿ. ƿ. ƿ.

g. ƿ. ƿ. 1. gratia. B. bere. 1. cortex.

h. ƿ. ƿ. 1. grando. S. ƿ. ƿ. 1. velu.

e. ƿ. ƿ. 1. patria. v. ƿ. ƿ. 1. nofter.

d. ƿ. ƿ. 1. dies.

th. ƿ. ƿ. 1. spina.

m. ƿ. ƿ. 1. homo. vil. mann.

a. ƿ. ƿ. 1. reueretia.

ae. ƿ. ƿ. 1. fraxing.

ea. ƿ. ƿ. 1. amg. vel. ear.

ƿ. ƿ. 1. lapis.

ƿ. ƿ. 1. lapis.

ƿ. ƿ. 1. lapis.

ƿ. ƿ. 1. lapis.

ƿ. ƿ. 1. lapis.

ƿ. ƿ. 1. lapis.

ƿ. ƿ. 1. lapis.

ƿ. ƿ. 1. lapis.

ƿ. ƿ. 1. lapis.

more until the necessary material is in my hands. Of course, it is possible that the names stood above the runes in the manuscript of the Runic Poem, having been inserted by some later scribe, but before Hickes's day. As for the phonological values, the variant runes, and the extra runes below, it is easy to show that all this was not in the manuscript of the Runic Poem, but was taken from the manuscript *Cottoniana Domit.*, A 9, and that by Hickes himself.

With the futhorc<sup>1</sup> of this manuscript we know Hickes was familiar,<sup>2</sup> for he copied it and printed it on the very next page to the one on which he gives us the Runic Poem. Hickes's copy is reproduced by Stephens, Vol. I, p. 102. A better copy was made by Madden for Stephens, and was reproduced by the latter on page 830. As I shall deal with this futhorc in detail in my forthcoming volume on *The Old-English Runic Futhorcs and Alphabets*, I shall here call attention to only the more important of its characteristics.<sup>3</sup> The futhorc is written in three lines and is the work of two scribes. The original writer set out to give only the runes, with phonological values below; but when he got to the end of the second line, instead of writing *ea*, he wrote *ear*, the name of the rune. And in the third line he continued to write the names below the runes, and the phonological values above. From this it would appear that he had two sources for his furthorc: (1) One that had the runes and below them their values, and that ended in *ea*. This is the stage of development of the Old-English futhorc that we find reflected on the Thames knife; there, too, we find the strange forms ʃ<sup>4</sup> and ʃ̇ for ʃ and ʃ̇. (2) One that had runes for *io* and the differentiated velars *k* and *g*, as well as the spurious runes *cweorth* and *stan*. This furthorc apparently

<sup>1</sup> In this paper I shall distinguish between a runic futhorc (in which the runes stand in the usual order: *f, u, þ, o, r, c*, etc.) and a runic alphabet (in which the runes are arranged in the A B C-order).

<sup>2</sup> It may be that he was entirely dependent upon the copy sent him by Wanley; cf. WANLEY, *Cat.*, p. 239, and STEPHENS, Vol. II, p. 829, bot.

<sup>3</sup> It seems to have escaped notice that the parchment is a palimpsest, at least so far as the lower half of the page is concerned. Under .*e. ethel. i. patria*, etc., I can read the beginning of a futhorc, and below that a runic alphabet, but not the one of Hickes's that Stephens refers to, p. 831, top.

<sup>4</sup> I am here going on the supposition that we may trust Stephens's very positive statements (3, p. 159) of the observations made by him and Franks, in opposition to those made by Gosch for Wimmer (*Die Runenschrift*, p. 82).

had the values above the runes, and the names below. In copying the values, the scribe first wrote the name *mg* instead of *ng*, but he then erased enough of the *i* to turn it into a dot or two dots (cf. the reproduction), similar to those about the other letters, and partially erased the one he had already made between *l* and *mg*.

The second scribe undertook to supply names for all the runes, squeezing them in above the writing of the first scribe. With both writers, acquaintance with the runes was at second hand only, a sort of antiquarian knowledge. It would appear that the later scribe knew them only from a copy in which they were arranged in A B C-order (as originally on the lower half of the page, cf. p. 2, footnote 3) and so had difficulty in identifying them when arranged, as here, in the futhorc order. It is strange that he did not avail himself of the aid that the first scribe's written phonological values offered him; in two cases, indeed, he undertook to change them. Thus he takes  $\mathfrak{M}$  to be *dæg*, and  $\mathfrak{B}$  to be *mann*, and changes the underwritten correct *m* and *d* to *d* and *m*. The tilted  $\mathfrak{J}$  he supposes to be an *s* and assigns it the name *sigel*. The odd s-rune  $\mathfrak{Y}$  he first took to be  $\mathfrak{V}$  and began to write the name *feoh*, but stopped after writing *fe*.<sup>1</sup> The name *tir* he assigns to  $\mathfrak{Y}$  as well as to  $\mathfrak{T}$ , and the name *inc* to  $\mathfrak{I}$  as well as to  $\mathfrak{X}$ . The similarity of the names and values of  $\mathfrak{Y}$   $\mathfrak{J}$   $\mathfrak{M}$   $\mathfrak{X}$  caused him much trouble. The first he leaves without name, assigning *iola* to *calc*, the second we have seen him take for an s-rune, the third he gives the name of the fourth, and this he leaves without a name. In the last line he got nothing at all right.

There are variants, in the original hand, written above the runes for *h*, *s*, and *æ*. The first of these is an *h*-rune whose erect shafts are near together and whose cross-bars extend beyond the shafts. It is preceded by  $\mathfrak{A}$  *vel* and between the top of the  $\mathfrak{I}$  and the rune is *.a.*<sup>2</sup> This *a* is exactly like those made by the

<sup>1</sup> The *f* is more curved than the other *f*'s of the second hand and backs up against the square dot that the first scribe put at the side of the variant rune above. Unfortunately, there is at this spot an imperfection in the half-tone reproduction, whereby the lower limb of the rune is shortened and a part of the *f*, as also the preceding dot, obliterated.

<sup>2</sup> There was once something written where the second dot now stands, that extended above it; I cannot make it out. The  $\mathfrak{A}$  is faint but quite distinct in the photograph, though it is hardly discernible in the half-tone reproduction. It was probably written and then erased by the scribe who afterwards wrote *vel*.

second scribe and was probably made by him. Whether or not he wrote the **&vel**, I cannot say. He evidently took the variant *h*-rune at first for an **ſ**, but decided that that was wrong and so tried to erase the **.a.** and the **vel** and, in so doing, partially erased the adjoining portion of the *h*-rune. Thus a careless glance catches only one shaft with two cross-bars (cf. reproduction). Between the two runes for *æ*, the second scribe has written *pro*, meaning that the upper may be used for the lower. These two forms are found side by side in *Galba*, A2 (Hickes, 3, tab. VI.=Stephens, No. 13). The name *gear* was first written with a letter after the *e* that has generally been taken for an *o* but appears to me to be an *r*; this letter is underdotted and an *a* is written above it. The name *ac* was first written *ac* and then changed to *ar*, or *vice versa*. In the list of names below, in a later hand, we find **.a. ar .i. reuerētia**. The would-be names inserted above the third line, by the second hand, I shall consider at another time; they have no interest for our present study.

Hickes's copy<sup>1</sup> of this futhorc (on the back of the page on which he prints the Runic Poem) reveals the following inaccuracies and errors. The remnant of the variant *h*-rune is placed by the side of the regular rune. The variant rune for *s* (as also the following *fe*) is omitted and for the one in the line the letter *R* is substituted, probably because Hickes misinterpreted the long *s* below as *r*, on account of the similarity existing between these letters in the Old-English hand. The variant *æ*-rune is omitted, so that the word *pro* appears as the name of the usual rune. The name *inc* over *l* is reproduced as *eac*. The name *lagu* is reproduced as *lagr*.

Madden's copy too, as reported by Stephens (2, p. 830), has numerous errors. It is evident that practically all of these are not due to Stephens but originated with Madden. The variant *h*-rune is ignored. The name over *l* is read as *iac* instead of *inc*. *peord* is read *peord*. The letters *fe* over the *s*-rune are conjectured to be *co* or *et*. *lagu* is read *lagr*. *:ng* is read *ing* (cf. p. 3 above). *mann* (the **.** is one of the two dots about the upper

<sup>1</sup>I have not deemed it necessary to reproduce this. GRIMM's reproduction (*Ueber deutsche Runen*, Tab. III, 2) is practically perfect.

		E Co
f	f <sup>feoh</sup>	býþ f
u	u <sup>ur</sup>	zif
ð	þ <sup>ðoim</sup>	býþ a
o	o <sup>or</sup>	ne
n	n <sup>nad</sup>	býþ ð
c	c <sup>cen</sup>	mar
z	z <sup>zyru</sup>	býþ o
uu	uu <sup>pen p</sup>	eoþ
h	h <sup>haesl</sup>	býþ o
n	n <sup>nyð</sup>	uþa
i	i <sup>ir</sup>	býþ c
38	38 <sup>3ep</sup>	hi a
eo	eo <sup>coh</sup>	gumer
p	p <sup>peoð</sup>	and
x	x <sup>colhx</sup>	ne bpu
		g bl
		býþ hþ
		pa.
		býþ ne
		hæl
		býþ o
		curt
		býþ z
		beoþ
		býþ u
		unt
		býþ r
		blip
		reccar
		bne

r	r <sup>stæl</sup>	re ma
τ	τ <sup>tyr</sup>	hib
b	b <sup>beoic</sup>	býþ t
e	e <sup>ch</sup>	ger
m	m <sup>an</sup>	býþ b
l	l <sup>lagu</sup>	tið
mg	mg <sup>uuz</sup>	býþ f
oe	oe <sup>cei</sup>	lege
ð	ð <sup>deð</sup>	býþ o
a	a <sup>ac</sup>	for
ae	ae <sup>aeþ</sup>	býþ le
y	y <sup>yr</sup>	ræ
to	to <sup>io rap</sup>	pær æ
ean	ean <sup>zir</sup>	geþ
cy eand	cy eand <sup>cap</sup>	býþ o
g	g	on
		býþ o
		to
		býþ on
		bæþ
		býþ oþe
		feoh
		býþ æþ
		lic on
		býþ ea
		pætrne
		býþ egle e
		ceoran t






Stan  
 ft z  
 38  
 3

æ-rune) is misread as *manis* ("plainly written," as Stephens says). The upper æ-rune is misinterpreted by Stephens as "an old Scandinavian type of the M." The application of *pro* is erroneous. *cweorð* is incorrectly given as *cwæorð*. The *cweorð*- and *calc*-runes are supplied with elaborate ceriphs. The K over the *calc*-rune is read *ic*. Stephens erroneously says, "R wanting." The *r*-rune is in its proper place, but the R that Hickes substituted (see p. 4 above) for the two forms of the *s*-rune does, of course, not appear.

There are two or three peculiarities about the futhorc of *Cot. Domit.* The first hand gave the *j*-rune the value *ge* and, as we saw above, wrote the name *ear*, instead of the value *ea*, under the *ea*-rune, and at first wrote *ing* under the *ng*-rune but later tried to change the *i* into *o* or *;*, though not very successfully. The second scribe gave the *w*-rune the name *wen* and, as we saw above, made numerous mistakes in identifying the runes.

Now, the values given in the Runic Poem coincide with those in *Cot. Domit.* even to the peculiarities pointed out above, namely, *ge*, the apparent *ing*, and *ear*. Even the would-be corrections of the later hand were copied by Hickes, and that with the identical spellings *deg* and *mann*, though he has *dæg* and [*m*]*an* in the column of names. The slight divergencies that appear are easily explained. Of the three values *z se st* given in *Cot. Domit.* for *stan*, Hickes has, for lack of room, omitted *se*. He was evidently in doubt concerning the K given in *Cot. Domit.* as the value of the *calc*-rune. In his copy of *Cot. Domit.* (Vol. I, p. 136), he correctly renders this as K, but as there is a horizontal line drawn through it in the manuscript, he gives the rune no value at all in his copy of the Runic Poem.<sup>1</sup>

But not only did Hickes transfer the phonological values from *Cot. Domit.* to the Runic Poem, he also got from the same source the variant runes that he gives in his transcript of the Runic Poem. This is true of the first *w*-rune, the first and the

<sup>1</sup> In this way Sievers (PAUL's *Grundriss*, Vol. I, plate "Runenalphabet") was misled into supposing that the rune in *cweorð*  above the *calc*-rune  was a repetition of the rune in *tir*  *ear* just above it, and that *cweorð*  really belonged to .



second *h*-runes, the first *n*-rune,<sup>1</sup> the first *h*-rune (‡), the first *ng*-rune, as well as all the runes that have no corresponding verses in the Runic Poem. It is interesting to observe that the runes that were taken over from *Cot. Domit.* are in all cases the first ones. It is evident that Hickes copied the Runic Poem with the runes in it in a column. He then prefixed the variant runes from *Cot. Domit.*, just as he prefixed the values. But the engraver (or Hickes himself, in making copy for the printer), not wishing to let the extra runes project at the left, moved the original runes a little to the right. Of the variant runes transferred from *Cot. Domit.*, the most interesting is the supposed ‡ *h*. We have seen that this form is due to Hickes's misreading of a half-erased ¶ and that, therefore, no such rune ever existed, either in the Runic Poem or in *Cot. Domit.*, though it has figured in all books on runes since Hickes's day.

It is clear that the rune-names that Hickes gives in his copy of the Runic Poem were not taken from *Cot. Domit.*, whatever their origin. There is, however, one exception to this. A glance at the reproduction makes it clear that Hickes (or his engraver) placed over the *w*-rune that was taken from *Cot. Domit.* the name that it has in that manuscript, that is, *wen*, and that he started to write over the rune from the Runic Poem the name it had in the Runic Poem, but that he did not write more than the first consonant.<sup>2</sup> How this happened may be explained in various ways. What is of importance to us is the fact that the name *wen* was introduced into the Runic Poem from *Cot. Domit.* The name is found nowhere else and has therefore no more authority than its occurrence in *Cot. Domit.* gives it. But we have seen that it was inserted into *Cot. Domit.* by the second scribe, a man who has shown that he was grossly ignorant of runes and runic matters. Under the circumstances, we are justified in assuming that he wrote *wen* for *wyn* under the influence of the preceding *cen*. Some years ago, Sievers showed (*Anglia*, Vol. XIII, pp. 3 ff.) that the Runic Poem and all other texts containing the

<sup>1</sup>The peculiar upper back-stroke seen in Hickes's reproduction is due to his misinterpretation of a crease in the parchment.

<sup>2</sup>All this is concealed by the disarrangements that WIMMER introduced (p. 85) into his copy of HICKES. Compare also his systematizing treatment of the latter part of the *futhorc*.

*w*-rune demand the name *wyn*, Gothic *uwinne*, and that this must, therefore, have been the original name of the rune; but, in deference to the occurrence of the form *wen* "in mehreren ags. runen-alphabeten," Sievers concedes that this name had currency later. I do not know what Sievers had in mind when he said the form *wen* was found in several Old-English futhorcs. We have seen that it is found only in *Cot. Domit.* and the Runic Poem; furthermore, that it was copied into the latter from the former, and that it owes its existence in the former to a late scribe who was guilty of numerous glaring errors. We may now, therefore, regard this specter name as finally laid.

Hitherto the forms, values, and names found in Hickes's transcription of the Runic Poem have been assigned chief importance in runic studies, for example, by both Wimmer (p. 85) and Sievers (as cited above). The bearing of the present study is this: The Runic Poem can be appealed to as evidence on runic matters only in regard to the right-hand forms (and perhaps most of the names) of those runes that have corresponding verses in the poem. The remaining runes and the phonological spellings added by Hickes have only so much value as they have in the *Cot. Domit.* manuscript. For the same reasons, the alphabet constructed by Hickes from the runes given by him as appearing in the Runic Poem, and published in his *Thesaurus* (Vol. III, tab. 2., No. 2, = Stephens, Vol. I, p. 104, No. 16) has no greater value. In other words, I have removed from the Runic Poem most of the rubbish that became attached to it in the process of its transmission to us, and which has been preserved, with more or less care, by those who have edited the poem.

GEORGE HEMPL.

ANN ARBOR.